

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.weylo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/806,206	03/23/2004	Takeshi Takahashi	119201	1908
25944 OLIFF & BER	7590 05/17/201 PRIDGE PLC	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 320	850	HODGE, ROBERT W		
ALEXANDRI	A, VA 22320-4850		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1795	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/17/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OfficeAction25944@oliff.com jarmstrong@oliff.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/806,206	TAKAHASHI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
ROBERT HODGE	1795	

	ROBERT HODGE	1795			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 03 May 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.			
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following replication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:     The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance FR 1.114. The reply must be filed	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth				
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of		36(a) and the appropriat	e extension fee		
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	nally set in the final Office	e action; or (2) as		
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t	filed within two months	s of the date of		
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi			appeal. Since		
AMENDMENTS					
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be     (a) They raise new issues that would require further corrections.	sideration and/or search (see NOT		cause		
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett		lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for		
appeal; and/or  (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims			
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	otou diamio.			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).		
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>		.,,			
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the		
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) thow the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an e	xplanation of		
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>2.17.19 and 20</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>21-23</u> .					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>					
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a		
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.		
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:		
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).				
	/Robert Hodge/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1795			

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants traversal of the restriction requirement made more than two and a hist years ago (specifically dated 96/07) is not timely or proper. Applicants canned resent claims to a non-elected invention for consideration on the merits after an election has been made. Claims 21-23 present subject matter that first was not originally presented and second, that does not read on applicants' election. So for at least the above two reasons the claims are properly withdrawn from consideration. With regards to the prior art rejections applicants continue to argue instead of providing irrefutable evidence that the Prior Art does not have the same properties (emphasis added) as the instantly claimed invention. Said arguments are reiterative of previously presented arguments and are therefore not persuavies for all the reasons made of record. In summary a prima facic case has been made and the burden has been properly shifted to applicants to prove in the form of evidence otherwise, said burden has still not been met.